

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are under active consideration.

The office has maintained the previous rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over LePeltier and FR (FR 2748021).

In addition to the remarks made in the response filed January 14, 2008, Applicants would like to make the following remarks in response to the Office Action mailed March 28, 2008.

Applicants make no other statements regarding the cited references; however, Applicants submit that any *prima facie* case of obviousness has been rebutted by a showing of superior or unexpected results (see MPEP 2144.09 (III)).

Specifically, Applicants direct the office to Examples 1 and 2 and the comparative example in the specification (pages 10-12). In Example 1, a catalyst containing platinum was prepared and used in Example 2 to dehydrogenate propane to propene. In Example 2, the catalyst was mixed with stealite (a catalytically inactive, inert diluent material) and placed in the catalyst bed. Propane was then dehydrogenated over the catalyst bed and the reaction products were measured at 2 hours and at 10 hours. The conversion and selectivity at these two times was 47% and 97% and 42% and 97%, respectively.

In the comparative example the catalyst prepared in Example 1 was not mixed with stealite in the catalyst bed. Here the 2 hour and 10 hour conversion and selectivity numbers were only 25% and 96% and 24% and 97%, respectively. Applicants note that the comparative catalyst system was similar to that in LePeltier which as the office notes on page 3 of the Office Action contains no catalytically inactive dilute material in the catalyst bed. Applicants also note that LePeltier shows dodecane conversions in the 6 to 15% range.

Applicants submit that the recited process gives an unexpected improvement in olefin conversion over the closest cited reference (LePeltier). In addition, Applicants note that FR only

shows isobutene to isobutene conversions in the 4.2 to 16.1% range (abstract), and therefore, conversions obtained from claimed process are superior or unexpected.

Overall, Applicants submit that the data given in the specification and given in the cited references demonstrate the superior or unexpected results from the claimed process. Accordingly, any *prima facie* case of obviousness has been rebutted by this showing. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the office withdraw the rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over the combination of LePeltier and FR.

In view of the above remarks, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 13156-00005-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: June 30, 2008

Respectfully submitted,
Electronic signature: /Donald K. Drummond,
Ph.D./
Donald K. Drummond, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 52,834
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1875 Eye Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant